

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/506,862	05/09/2005	Konrad Kuerzinger	WP 21590 US	4697
23690 ROCHE DIAG	7590 10/03/200 NOSTICS OPERATIO	EXAMINER		
9115 Hague Road			LANGEL, WAYNE A	
Indianapolis, IN 46250-0457			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			1754	
		•		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/506,862	KUERZINGER ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Wayne Langel	1754		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tire will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 September 2004</u> is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some color None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s)				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1-10-05. 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

Application/Control Number: 10/506,862

Art Unit: 1754

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over either Karvinen or Michalczyk et al. No distinction is seen between the metal oxide particles disclosed by Karvinen and Michalczyk et al, and that recited in claim 8.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over either Horne et al or Murayama et al. No distinction is seen between the metal oxide particles disclosed by Horne et al and Murayama et al, and that recited in claim 8.

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horne et al or Murayama et al or Karvinen or Michalczyk et al. The uses recited in

Application/Control Number: 10/506,862

Art Unit: 1754

claims 9-12 are conventional uses for metal oxide particles. It would be obvious to use the metal oxide particles of Horne et al or Murayama et al or Karvinen or Michalczyk et al for such conventional uses.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is indefinite as to what would constitute "known metal oxide precursors". It is also indefinite as to how the target molecule and alkylalkoxy compound are "used". In claim, it is indefinite as to whether the metal oxide particle would necessarily have the properties which would result from the sol-gel process of claims 1-7, since the claim recites that the metal oxide particle is "obtainable" (rather than obtained) by such process. Claims 9-12 provide for the use of a particle, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claims 4-12 are rejected under 35 USC 112 paragragh 5 in constituting multiple dependent claims which fail to depend from the parent claims in the alternative only.

Application/Control Number: 10/506,862

Art Unit: 1754

Claims 5-12 are further rejected in constituting multiple dependent claims which depend from other multiple dependent claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: EP 0658525 discloses the use of polyhalogenated metal alkylalkoxy compounds for producing water-repellant films from which claims 1-7 differ in that the polyhalogenated metal alkylalkoxy compound is used together with the metal oxide precursor in a sol-gel process. The end product differs accordingly in that it has polyhalogenated compounds both within the particle and on its surface, and would therefor not be obvious.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne Langel whose telephone number is 571-272-1353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8 am - 3:30 pm Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 10/506,862

Art Unit: 1754

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Wayne Langel Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1754